

In-Network Linear Regression with Arbitrarily Split Data Matrices

François D. Côté, Ioannis N. Psaromiligkos, and Warren J. Gross

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses for the first time the problem of how networked agents can collaboratively fit a linear model when each agent only ever has an *arbitrary* summand of the regression data.

A. Problem Statement

Consider a network of agents (these can be computers, data centers, etc.), all concerned with a given process. Each agent has amassed some measurements of some features of the process, along with observations, or labels, of those measurements. Let X be a matrix comprising all the measurements of the process across the network. Suppose that there are a total of n real-valued measurements (examples) of each of p features, so that $X \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$. Let y in $\mathbf{R}^n$ be a vector comprising the (real) labels of the examples. It is possible that no agent has the full data, but the data of all the agents covers X and y . Fig. 1 highlights what part of X an agent may have. Agents may have blocks of entire columns (features), as in Fig. 1(a), entire rows (examples), as in Fig. 1(b), or blocks of partitions, as in Fig. 1(c), but also arbitrary parts, possibly nonrectangular and overlapping, as in Fig. 1(d). The latter typifies a case not yet considered in the literature.

In this paper, our goal is to have each agent linearly regress y on X within a residual ℓ_2 -norm of ϵ , and to regularize the solution through a cost function $f: \mathbf{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. In other words, each agent must solve the optimization problem

$$P_0: \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} f(\beta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|X\beta - y\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

To clarify the context, we lay down some assumptions:

- 1) f is a closed proper convex function (not necessarily smooth);
- 2) each agent knows f and ϵ , and the number of agents, say m , in the network;
- 3) the network is connected; but
- 4) an agent can only communicate with its neighbors in the network; though
- 5) no agent can divulge its part of (X, y) ; and
- ★) each agent knows where in X and y its part lies and which subparts are repeated among other agents and how many times.

Let us label the agents 1 to m , and comment on assumption ★. Because of this key assumption, agent i can express its part of the data as a matrix X_i and a vector y_i , so that among all the agents, $X = X_1 + \dots + X_m$ and $y = y_1 + \dots + y_m$. Of course, $X_i \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$ and $y_i \in \mathbf{R}^n$, and by assumption 5, neither can be transferred between agents.

We can now formally describe our goal. It is to solve the problem

$$P_1: \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} f(\beta) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|(X_1 + \dots + X_m)\beta - (y_1 + \dots + y_m)\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \\ \text{abiding by assumptions 1–5.}$$

The authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 0E9, Canada (e-mail: francois.cote@mail.mcgill.ca; yannis@ece.mcgill.ca; warren.gross@mcgill.ca).




Fig. 1. Examples of data splitting by (a) features, (b) examples, (c) blocks of both, and (d) nonrectangular and overlapping blocks.

B. Related Work

To the best of our knowledge, P_1 has never been posed in such a general form. Many works have considered special cases of the problem, with either specific ways of splitting the data among the agents or specific network topologies. Our work is most related to a combination of the notions put forth by Mota et al. [1]–[3] and Parikh and Boyd [4], the former considering feature and example splittings of X (see Fig. 1(a) and 1(b)), while the latter considering block splitting (see Fig. 1(c)) tied to a specific network topology. These works do not consider an arbitrary splitting of X (Fig. 1(d)); however, such a splitting is very plausible: an agent could have more measurements of some features than of others, and could have measurements that another agent has. In this paper, we fill this gap.

In solving P_1 , the algorithm we provide is based on the Douglas-Rachford proximal splitting method [5]. It falls in a growing body of recent work on applying splitting methods, like the alternating directions method of multipliers (ADMM), to obtain distributed algorithms; such work is perhaps most inspired by Boyd et al. [6].

C. Contributions

The contributions of our work are as follows.

- We present a framework for in-network optimization (Section II), in which fits P_1 , and we develop a general algorithm (Algorithm 1).
- To make P_1 amenable to the framework, we provide a new result (Proposition 1) that describes how the constraint in P_1 can be separated.
- We solve P_1 by deriving a specific algorithm (Algorithm 2), and we establish that this algorithm converges.

II. A FRAMEWORK

In this section we present a general, variable-centric framework for optimization in a network. Using the framework, we propose a distributed algorithm for solving a general class of problems. The developed framework parallels the strategy described by Parikh and Boyd [7], but is specifically adapted to the network setting. It can also be used for the class of problems formalized by Mota et al. [2]. The tools developed here will be employed later to achieve our goal, to solve P_1 .

A. Network Description

We represent a network by a graph, which consists of nodes and edges. The nodes correspond to agents; the edges, to pairs of agents. As we did for the agents, we label the nodes 1 to m . We let edges represent pairs of agents that can communicate with each other. We




Fig. 2. Variables in a network.

denote an edge that joins agents i and j by the ordered pair (i, j) , $i < j$. We denote the set of all edges by $\mathcal{E}$, and the set of all nodes forming an edge with i by $\mathcal{N}_i$. The nodes in $\mathcal{N}_i$ are the neighbors of i .

B. Variables

In general, an optimization problem in a network involves several variables. We assume that the variables are vectors of (possibly different) real finite vector spaces. Some of these variables are specific to each agent, with some neighbors having access to some parts of them.

Let us consider such variables in a network. As a simple example, we refer to Fig. 2. Each edge involves the variables that can be communicated between agents. Edge (i, j) involves the variable z_{ij} . This is the part of the variable of agent i that can be accessed by neighboring agent j . And similarly for z_{ji} .

We group all the vectors in the network into a single vector z . This vector lies in a real finite vector space $\mathcal{Z}$. We also group the vectors according to edges or nodes, forming two different partitions of z . In the example,

$$z = (z_{12}, (z_{21}, z_{23}), z_{32}) = ((z_{12}, z_{21}), (z_{23}, z_{32})). \quad (1)$$

node partition edge partition

We denote all the variables at each node i by a single variable z_i in a real finite vector space. We refer to this space as $\mathcal{Z}_i$. In the example,

$$z_1 = z_{12}, \quad z_2 = (z_{21}, z_{23}), \quad z_3 = z_{32}, \quad (2)$$

and in general, $z_i = (z_{ij})_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$.

C. In-Network Optimization

The variables that we previously introduced are involved in an optimization problem, and we now give a general description of that problem.

Let us assign to each node a real-valued cost $g_i(z_i)$, and to each edge a real-valued cost $g_{ij}(z_{ij}, z_{ji})$. We assume that the costs on an edge are the same in both directions,

$$g_{ij}(z_{ij}, z_{ji}) = g_{ji}(z_{ji}, z_{ij}),$$

but that they only count as one cost. The idea is to have the agents work together to determine their variables, collectively solving

$$P_2: \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(z_i) + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} g_{ij}(z_{ij}, z_{ji}).$$

Remark: Suppose that the agents just needed to minimize the first sum above. They could work independently, each agent i determining z_i . They could do this because the objective would be separable, being a sum of terms depending on different parts of z , together forming a partition of z . Thus, each agent i would just need to minimize $g_i(z_i)$. Similarly, suppose that the agents just needed to minimize the second sum. Pairs of agents could work on separate

problems. In P_2 , however, the variables are all coupled. The parts in the node and edge partitions overlap (see (1), for example).

To obtain a distributed approach, we would like the agents to work with each sum in P_2 separately. Splitting methods allow us to do this. The most versatile method, requiring only a few assumptions on the problem, is the Douglas-Rachford method (see [5, (27.23)], in particular). This method leads to another approach, ADMM [6], which has gained popular currency for distributed optimization. Although we can also use ADMM in the present framework, we choose to use the Douglas-Rachford method, because ADMM ends up requiring more exchanges between agents.

In employing the Douglas-Rachford method to solve P_2 , the key component is the proximal operator. We denote the proximal operator of a closed proper convex function, say $g: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, by prox_g . Applied to a vector in $\mathcal{Z}$, say ζ , the operator gives the unique solution, also in $\mathcal{Z}$, to the following problem:

$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} g(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|z - \zeta\|_2^2.$$

Solving our problem using the Douglas-Rachford method involves the proximal operator of each of the sums in the objective of P_2 . Each operator then entails an optimization problem that can be separated into independent subproblems, with each agent i actually handling prox_{g_i} and each (i, j) pair handling $\text{prox}_{g_{ij}}$. This decomposition is what allows us to develop an algorithm specifically for the network scenario. We present this algorithm next.

D. In-Network Douglas-Rachford Algorithm

To solve P_2 in a distributed way, we give a description of the part of the Douglas-Rachford method that each agent needs to execute. In that description, we introduce auxiliary variables, $\tilde{z}$ and $\hat{z}$. Note that these variables follow the same indexing scheme and corresponding partition structure as described previously (refer to (1) and (2), for example).

Algorithm 1: Choose positive numbers λ and ρ , with ρ less than 2. At node i in the network, initialize $z_{i,0}$ to any vector in $\mathcal{Z}_i$, and repeat the following:
After k iterations,

- 1) get $z_{ji,k}$ from each neighbor j ;
- 2) for each j in $\mathcal{N}_i$, compute $(\tilde{z}_{ij,k+1}, \tilde{z}_{ji,k+1})$ from $\text{prox}_{\lambda g_{ij}}(z_{ij,k}, z_{ji,k})$, and assemble $\tilde{z}_{i,k+1}$;
- 3) $\hat{z}_{i,k+1} = \text{prox}_{\lambda g_i}(2\tilde{z}_{i,k+1} - z_{i,k})$; and
- 4) $z_{i,k+1} = z_{i,k} + \rho(\hat{z}_{i,k+1} - \tilde{z}_{i,k+1})$.

Under certain conditions (see the text following Proposition 2 in the next section, for example), the sequence (of node variables) $\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, \dots$ converges to the solution of P_2 , with each agent having determined its part of that solution.

III. SOLVING P_1

The main obstacle in solving P_1 is that the constraint couples the data of the agents. Luckily, we can prove the following proposition, which allows us to reformulate the constraint.

Proposition 1: There exist in $\mathbf{R}^n$ vectors $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ that sum to 0 and for which the set

$$\{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p : \|(X_1 + \dots + X_m)\beta - (y_1 + \dots + y_m)\|_2 \leq \epsilon\}$$

is equal to the set comprising every β such that

$$\|X_1\beta - y_1 + \alpha_1\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{m}, \dots, \|X_m\beta - y_m + \alpha_m\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{m}.$$

A. Fitting P_1 to the Framework

By introducing variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ and using Proposition 1, we can fit P_1 to the framework described in Section II.

Let us first specify z_{ij} from the framework to be (a_{ij}, b_{ij}) , which can be taken as a vector in $\mathbf{R}^{n+p}$. The vector a_{ij} in $\mathbf{R}^n$ is related to α_i , and the vector b_{ij} in $\mathbf{R}^p$ is related to β . To understand these relations, consider the following observation: Since the network is connected, if $b_{ij} = b_{ji}$ along every edge (i, j) , and at the same time, at every node i , if b_{ij} is equal to some β for every j in $\mathcal{N}_i$, then all agents must agree on the same β . If $\alpha_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}$, then provided that $a_{ij} = -a_{ji}$ along every edge (i, j) , it must be true that $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 0$.

We can now describe the edge and node costs. For edge (i, j) ,

$$g_{ij}(z_{ij}, z_{ji}) = \begin{cases} f(\beta) & \text{if } a_{ij} = -a_{ji} \text{ and } b_{ij} = b_{ji} = \beta; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

And for node i ,

$$g_i(z_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } b_{ij} \text{ is equal to some } \beta \text{ for all } j \text{ in } \mathcal{N}_i, \text{ and} \\ & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} \text{ is equal to some } \alpha_i, \text{ with } \beta \text{ and } \alpha_i \\ & \text{being such that } \|X_i \beta - y_i + \alpha_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon/m; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, with these costs, P_1 and P_2 are equivalent, in the sense that in P_2 , the b_{ij} part of the solution (the part obtained by agent i for every j in $\mathcal{N}_i$) coincides with the minimizing β in P_1 .

B. In-Network Douglas-Rachford Algorithm for Linear Regression

Solving P_1 is now just a matter of implementing Algorithm 1. Applying the required proximal operators, and simplifying, we obtain the following:

Algorithm 2: Choose positive numbers λ and ρ , with ρ less than 2. Let $F_\lambda(\cdot)$ denote $2\text{prox}_{(\lambda/2)f}((1/2)\cdot)$. At each node i , for all j in $\mathcal{N}_i$, initialize $a_{ij,0}$ to any vector in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $b_{ij,0}$ to any vector in $\mathbf{R}^p$. Repeat the following at each node i :

After k iterations,

- 1) get $a_{ji,k}$ and $b_{ji,k}$ from each neighbor j ;
- 2) find the collection $(a_{ij})_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$ of vectors each in $\mathbf{R}^n$ that add up to some α_i and the vector β in $\mathbf{R}^p$ that together minimize

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \left\{ \|a_{ij} + a_{ji,k}\|_2^2 + \|\beta + b_{ij,k} - F_\lambda(b_{ij,k} + b_{ji,k})\|_2^2 \right\}$$

subject to the constraint that

$$\|X_i \beta - y_i + \alpha_i\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{m},$$

and assign the minimizing vectors to $(\hat{a}_{ij,k+1})_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{i,k+1}$; and

- 3) update:

$$a_{ij,k+1} = a_{ij,k} - \frac{\rho}{2}(a_{ij,k} - a_{ji,k}) + \rho \hat{a}_{ij,k+1},$$

and

$$b_{ij,k+1} = b_{ij,k} - \frac{\rho}{2}F_\lambda(b_{ij,k} + b_{ji,k}) + \rho \hat{\beta}_{i,k+1}.$$

We can say the following about the convergence of Algorithm 2:

Proposition 2: At each node i , the sequence $\hat{\beta}_{i,1}, \hat{\beta}_{i,2}, \dots$ converges to the solution of P_1 (and thus P_0).

The proof of Proposition 2 amounts to showing that the two sums in P_2 each correspond to closed proper convex functions of z , and

that those functions satisfy a certain condition (for the particular condition, see [5, Corollary 27.7(a)]).

IV. A NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT

In this section we provide an example of how our algorithm can be used.

We consider P_1 with f as the ℓ_1 -norm. In this case, F_λ in the algorithm is the soft-thresholding operator [7, (6.9)]. We consider a network of 6 nodes. The network is generated like this: We randomly pick nodes with replacement. Consecutively picked nodes that are not the same are made neighbors. Keeping track of the picked nodes, we continue this process until all the nodes have been picked. In the network, we consider data from a 20×40 matrix X and a corresponding vector y , both chosen randomly from independent normal entries of mean 0 and variance 1. The matrix is split among the agents in the same way as shown in Fig. 1(d). We perform the regression with ϵ set to 0.01. For the parameters of the algorithm, we fix ρ to 1.9 and λ to 0.02. We illustrate in Fig. 3 the convergence of the algorithm. The plot shows the relative error, between the estimate $\hat{\beta}_{i,k}$ of an arbitrary agent i and an estimate, $\hat{\beta}$, computed centrally with X and y :

$$\varepsilon(k) = \frac{\|\hat{\beta}_{i,k} - \hat{\beta}\|_2}{\|\hat{\beta}\|_2}.$$

The plot depicts the typical error curve [8] seen when using the Douglas-Rachford method to solve ℓ_1 -minimization problems.




Fig. 3. An example run of Algorithm 2.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. F. C. Mota, J. M. F. Xavier, P. M. Q. Aguiar, and M. Püschel, "D-ADMM: A communication-efficient distributed algorithm for separable optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 10, 2013.
- [2] —, "Distributed optimization with local domains: Applications in MPC and network flows," arXiv:1305.1885, 2013.
- [3] —, "Distributed compressed sensing algorithms: Completing the puzzle," in *Proc. GlobalSIP*, 2013, p. 629.
- [4] N. Parikh and S. Boyd, "Block splitting for distributed optimization," *Math. Program. Comput.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 77–102, 2014.
- [5] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. New York, NY: Springer, 2011.
- [6] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [7] N. Parikh and S. Boyd, "Proximal algorithms," *Found. Trends in Optim.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 123–231, 2013.
- [8] L. Demanet and X. Zhang, "Eventual linear convergence of the Douglas Rachford iteration for basis pursuit," arXiv:1301.0542, 2013.